

THE LITTLE ROCK RECALL ELECTION

Henry M. Alexander

INTRODUCTION

The events described in this case study reached a climax during a twenty-day period in May, 1959, at Little Rock, seat of Pulaski County and capital city of Arkansas.

The period began shortly after 3:00 P.M. on the afternoon of May 5 when three of the six members of the Little Rock school board voted at a "rump session" of questionable legality not to renew the annual contracts of forty-four employees of the school district: the superintendent, some principals and teachers, and others. The dismissal of these employees, to be dubbed an "outrageous purge" by petitioners invoking the recall to remove these three members from the school board, took place after the other three members had "walked out" of the session to deprive the meeting of a quorum.

The period ended on May 25 at 6:30 P.M. At this time tired judges and clerks serving as election officials at forty-three ballot boxes within thirty-one polling places began the laborious task of counting and tabulating ballots cast by 25,457 voters in the Little Rock School District recall election.

SETTING

On the morning of September 4, 1957, fifteen-year old Elizabeth Eckford and Jefferson Thomas, with seven other Negro children, were denied admission to Little Rock's Central High School by national guardsmen who barred their entrance on orders of Governor Orval E. Faubus to "maintain order." On the morning of August 12, 1959, almost two years later, Elizabeth Eckford and Jefferson Thomas climbed the broad steps of Little Rock's Central High School, entered the building, attended classes. The two Negro children entered the building unmolested because officers of the Little Rock police department halted a "march on the school" of about 250 segregationists from the grounds of the state capitol where the governor, advising against violence, had said: "I see no reason for you to be beaten over the head today." A few marchers were beaten over the head by police officers; some were drenched with water by city firemen; nineteen were arrested and charged with loitering, resisting arrest, or disturbing the peace.

The course of events on these two mornings, each the opening day of a school term, was altered by the reaction of voters in the Little Rock School

1

HUNT LIBRARY
CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIVERSITY
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15213

NOV 14 '78

District to the outrageous purge, reflected in the tabulation of ballots cast in the recall election.

LITTLE ROCK

The population of Little Rock in May, 1959, was about 106,000. Negroes, comprising about 24 percent of the population, resided chiefly in several scattered neighborhoods throughout the city, but, with the exception of extensive areas in western and southwestern Little Rock, also had homes adjacent to homes of white residents in other sections. A large majority of the city's white residents shared the racial attitudes and traditions of the South. A total of 41,893 residents of the city were eligible to vote in the recall election: approximately 35,620 whites; 6,273 Negroes.*

Little Rock adopted a city manager plan of municipal government in November, 1957. Local politics was free of bossism and machine control; municipal and school district administration, free of the spoils system. The integration-segregation issue, dominant during recent years in state and school district elections, had had a minor role in municipal politics. Two newspapers, with a combined daily circulation of about 200,000, were published in the city: the *Arkansas Gazette*, in the morning; the *Arkansas Democrat*, in the afternoon. There were eight radio and three television broadcasting stations in the metropolitan area.

The city had an area of 27.6 square miles in May, 1959, but the Little Rock School District was somewhat larger, so that the boundaries were not wholly coterminous.

The school district is governed by a board of six members elected for staggered terms of three years. Two are chosen at annual school elections held on the first Tuesday of December. Members receive no compensation. Annually they select a president, vice president, and secretary. President in May, 1959, was Ed I. McKinley, Jr., one-time city attorney and a former head of the state banking department. Members of all local school districts—and the three members of the city commission in Fort Smith—are the only public officials in Arkansas subject to removal from office by the recall.

In 1959 the school district contained 22,903 children of school age. It employed 808 teachers in its 4 high, 6 junior high, and 26 elementary schools. Enrollment totaled 19,846; included 14,048 whites, 5,798 Negroes. All but two of the 36 public schools were racially segregated. Five Negro students were enrolled at Central High School; three at Hall High School.

PUPIL PLACEMENT

School boards in Arkansas were authorized in two similar statutory enactments to assign and to transfer students to particular schools on grounds of

* The poll tax receipt in Arkansas, executed in duplicate by the county collector when payment is received either by mail or across the counter, contains a blank space in which the collector is required to indicate the "color" of the taxpayer. The color of the taxpayer, if the tax is paid across the counter, is indicated on the receipt and, as the duplicate is filed by the collector, is a public record in his office. The color of the taxpayer usually cannot be indicated on the receipt when payment is made by mail.

one or more of sixteen listed reasons, not including race or color. These pupil assignment acts were relied upon in Little Rock by the school board—and by the public—to curb the pace and extent of racial integration in public schools. One was initiated by petition and ratified at the general election in 1956 by a vote of 214,712 to 121,129. In substance the initiated statute was reenacted with minor amendment by the legislature during the regular session of 1959.*

MODERATES AND SEGREGATIONISTS

An overwhelming majority of white voters in Little Rock preferred racially segregated schools. No community leader, including moderates on the school board in May, 1959, advocated school integration. In Arkansas, and as used in this study, the terms “moderate” and “segregationist” have been narrowed by the course of events to the issue of segregation or desegregation in the public schools. A moderate favors racially segregated public schools, if legally possible. If not legally possible, he prefers delayed and minimum compliance with the laws of the land and with court decrees to any degree of overt obstruction. A segregationist favors racially segregated public schools, if legally possible. If not legally possible, he prefers overt obstruction—by evasion or defiance—of laws of the land and of court decrees to any degree of compliance. In Little Rock during May, 1959, a minimum of compliance involved token integration in some public schools during the 1959-60 school year. A minimum of obstruction involved some closed public schools during the same school year. From all appearances a very large majority of segregationists in Little Rock preferred to limit their obstruction to tactics of evasion; a very small minority supported tactics of defiance. Similarly, a very small minority of white voters in Little Rock were “integrationist,” preferring a degree and speed of racial integration, in public schools and in other phases of community life, beyond that demanded by the law of the land and court decrees.

White voters in Little Rock during the years immediately preceding 1959 were almost evenly divided; 55 percent voting for the nomination of Governor Faubus to a third term; 56 percent for the nomination of Dr. Dale Alford for Congress; 53 percent for Robert W. Laster as a member of the school board. An overwhelming majority of Negro voters were integrationists.

While the segregationists constituted a small majority of white voters, they had the advantage of established organization and leadership. Moderates in Little Rock, however, did not lack a voice to define their position and to defend their objectives. The *Arkansas Gazette*—awarded a Pulitzer Prize in 1958 for “demonstrating the highest qualities of civic leadership, journalistic responsibility and moral courage in the face of mounting public tension”—had been the “voice of moderation” in the city (and in the state) from the outset of the integration-segregation controversy.

* The two Arkansas pupil assignment acts were upheld as constitutional “on their face” by the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals in September, 1959. Validity of these acts as applied locally by the Little Rock school board was then challenged in the United States District Court at Little Rock by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Attorneys for the NAACP alleged, among other things, that the acts as applied infringed upon the original plan of gradual integration of public schools in Little Rock approved by the Federal courts.

FAUBUS INTERVENES

Governor Faubus was nominated for an almost unprecedented third term at the Democratic primary on July 29, 1958, defeating two strong opponents by an impressive majority of 264,346 to 119,558, more than two to one. Faubus carried every one of the 75 counties of the state; polled 51.2 percent of the votes cast in the city of Little Rock. The integration-segregation issue subordinated all others in the campaign, and Governor Faubus viewed his landslide victory as a popular mandate for continuing opposition to integration of public schools in Arkansas.

Upon call of the governor, a special session of the state legislature met at Little Rock in August, 1958, and approved a "package" of enactments either sponsored or endorsed by the governor. This package included Acts 4 and 9. Act 4 authorized the governor, by proclamation, to close any or all public schools within any school district pending a referendum "for" or "against" the "racial integration of all schools within the school district." Act 9, drafted on the initiative of Attorney General Bruce Bennett, an outspoken segregationist who thought of himself as a candidate for governor in 1960, authorized the removal by recall of any or all members of local school district boards.

CAPITAL CITIZENS' COUNCIL

The Capital Citizens' Council, organized locally in Little Rock during April, 1955, had become the most vocal and potent group within the community by 1958. The organization had a governing board of 35 members. President during 1958 was Reverend Wesley Pruden, pastor of the Broadmoor Baptist Church; during 1959, Dr. Malcolm G. Taylor, an osteopath. Chief spokesman for the organization throughout its existence was Amis Guthridge, attorney and furniture dealer, who had unsuccessfully opposed Brooks Hays in 1952 and 1958. Guthridge currently was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for attorney general. The Council in Arkansas was said to have 50 local organizations in the state. Its purpose, according to publications of the organization, was to oppose racial integration by "speeches, leaflets, newspaper and television publicity." The Capital Citizens' Council in Little Rock also resorted to economic boycott. The local organization, according to the *Arkansas Gazette*, "has set itself up as the voice of the community. Any one who has dared to dissent from its violent views has been subjected to overt and covert threats of reprisal." The *Arkansas Gazette* was a primary object and probably the primary victim of the organization's economic boycott. Fear of reprisal created an uneasy atmosphere in Little Rock. Some political or economic hazard, for example, was incurred by a normally innocuous endorsement of "public education" by an educational organization. A meeting of the Pulaski County Medical Society was adjourned during the spring of 1959 to avoid voting on a resolution endorsing "law and order." Similar situations elsewhere in the South moved Hodding Carter to observe in 1957 that "the First Amendment of our Constitution is probably in more danger in the South today than are our white and Negro children."

HISTORY OF RECALL LEGISLATION

Segregationist leaders in Little Rock, although they approved its enactment, asserted that the bill which became Act 9 was neither drafted nor sponsored at their request. "It has been found," the bill's emergency clause stated, "that many citizens are currently dissatisfied with the school board members serving their district . . . that such school districts currently have no method of coping with this situation, and the passage of this act will alleviate such conditions. . . ." The immediate objective of legislators voting for the bill was the removal of moderates then serving on the Little Rock school board, its entire membership with the exception of Dr. Alford.

Although no open, popular advocacy of the recall preceded the introduction of the recall legislation on August 26, it was approved, two days later, by the lower chamber by a vote of 73 to 17. Seven of the eight members representing Pulaski County voted against the measure. Amendments, offered by one of the seven, provided that recall petitions be signed by voters equal to 15 rather than 10 percent of the eligible voters of a school district; that vacancies arising from the recall of incumbents be filled by the county board of education rather than by the county judge; and that only one recall election could be held within a school district during any school year. The bill was approved in the upper chamber on the same day by a vote of 24 to 10. The three senators from Pulaski County voted against approval. The legislation contained an emergency clause, enabling it to take effect when signed by Governor Faubus on September 12. Obviously its enactment reflected the eagerness of most legislators to support the governor in his opposition to forcible integration of public schools.

A few leaders of segregationist organizations in Arkansas had sought statutory provision for the recall of school board members since July, 1955. In that month the public schools in Hoxie, a municipality of 1,855 inhabitants in Lawrence County, in northeastern Arkansas, were opened on a basis of racial integration. The Hoxie school board—stating that racial integration in public schools was in keeping with Christian principles, in compliance with the law of the national constitution, and financially economical—admitted eighteen Negro and approximately 1,000 white students to local schools. Opposition in Hoxie to school integration was vigorous and vocal. Local segregationists circulated a petition requesting the school board to defer integration, but the board announced its refusal on August 15. Meanwhile, on August 13, approximately 700 segregationists at an outdoor meeting were urged to sign a second petition requesting the resignation of moderates on the school board. In reply to this second petition, signed by 1,063 persons, the board stated: "We have considered the names on the petitions and our answer is that we have no comment."

Amis Guthridge, attorney for the Capital Citizens' Council of Little Rock, was in Hoxie on and after the day of the outdoor meeting to confer with local segregationists. Residents were urged not to enroll their children in public schools; consideration was given to proposals to compel the closing of local public schools by withdrawal of financial support; proposals were advanced to annex the local school district to an adjacent, segregated district.

On August 20, newsmen in Hoxie were told by Guthridge that "we have action planned." Not revealed at the time, the "action planned" was the authorization by statute of the recall of school board members. Guthridge on many subsequent occasions urged Governor Faubus to sponsor such a statutory enactment. The pleas of Guthridge were echoed by James T. Karam, a Little Rock clothier, prominent as a spokesman for segregationists.

Under authority of Act 9 of 1958, petitions seeking the recall of the five moderates then on the Little Rock school board were circulated late in September, 1958, by the Mothers' League of Central High School—a small, aggressive, and vocal segregationist organization established in August, 1957. These petitions, according to Mrs. Margaret C. Jackson, outspoken president of the Mothers' League, were signed by 10,000 voters. They were never filed.

THE RECALL LAW

As defined by Act 9 of 1958, the recall is "the voting by the people of any school district . . . to ascertain whether or not it is the desire of a majority of the electors therein to allow a school board member or members to remain in that capacity for the duration of his or their elected term." The 422 school districts in the state during 1958 had a total of 2,215 members. Eleven recall elections have been held in as many school districts, of which only two—at Little Rock and at Hoxie—involved the integration-segregation issue. The infrequent use of the recall device in Arkansas, the brevity of the enabling statute, and the absence of judicial interpretation left many legal questions unanswered. Recall petitions, filed with the county clerk, must be signed by at least 15 percent of the qualified voters of a school district. It was assumed in Little Rock, on the basis of informed estimates, that approximately 6,300 signatures were legally required in May, 1959, to invoke the recall.

THE CRISIS COMES

On September 12, 1958, the United States Supreme Court ordered the Little Rock school board to proceed immediately in compliance with its judicially approved plan of gradual integration. Governor Faubus forthwith closed the four high schools in Little Rock, three traditionally for white and one for Negro students, under authority of Act 4 and ordered a referendum within the school district on September 27.

WOMEN'S EMERGENCY COMMITTEE ORGANIZES

The Women's Emergency Committee to Open Our Schools was created on September 16, 1958, in the *ante bellum* home of Mrs. David D. Terry. It was prompted by unofficial recommendations repeatedly offered to Mrs. Terry by a member of the board of the Arkansas Council on Human Relations, a small crusading organization dedicated to defense in Arkansas of equal opportunity for all groups. Original membership was forty-eight. Mrs. Terry, a life-long resident of the city, was instrumental in the establishment of the

committee, as was Mrs. Joe R. Brewer, a resident of Scott, a nearby community in Pulaski County. Mrs. Brewer was president of the committee. Mrs. Brewer and Mrs. Terry are alumnae of eastern women's colleges. The WEC was established to act "in any emergency that might develop where a voice should be heard in the jungle of doubt, suspicion and fear which has plagued the citizens of Little Rock from the time Governor Faubus called out the National Guard to keep Negro children from attending Central High School." It adopted four immediate goals:

1. "To get the four free public high schools reopened."
2. "To get the students back in their classes."
3. "To retain our staff of good teachers."
4. "To regain full accreditation by the North Central Association."

To achieve these immediate goals, the WEC encouraged "influentials" in the community to place themselves on record as supporting the reopening of the four closed high schools.

Membership of the committee grew slowly; it reached approximately 1,600 in May, 1959. The committee was well organized, well financed, but regarded by all segregationists and many moderates as "extreme" and "integrationist." A "white father of three" in a typical anonymous letter to the committee, requested it to "please stop mailing me your tripe sheets . . . I am truly joining the (Capital) Citizens' Council . . ." since "I sat in on one of your meetings as an observer and came to the conclusion that your sole aim is to race-mix our schools. . . ." The governing body of the WEC did include some integrationists, but possessed a substantial majority of moderates. The influence of the committee rested upon the loyalty, energy, and prestige of its membership. Its membership, moreover, overlapped considerably with that of other women's organizations. Its members—as representatives of the organization and, in many significant instances, as wives—had access to and influence with individuals in public office and in positions of leadership in local civic and professional organizations.

The committee maintained an office and a full-time executive secretary during most of its existence. The location of its office was not publicized; its telephone number was unlisted. Through a well-organized "telephone chain," leaders of the committee could reach any part of the membership within a period of a few minutes.

The WEC was the only organization in the city publicly to urge an affirmative vote in the referendum on September 27, 1958, "for the racial integration of all schools within the school district." Aided by its legal adviser and a public relations consultant, the committee sponsored two television programs to win support for its stand on this issue. The committee used neighborhood "coke parties" in private homes where guests heard local attorneys explain issues at stake in the referendum. The "coke parties" were disappointing. One member invited 120 friends to her home; nine attended.

THE REFERENDUM

Since voters in the referendum opposed "racial integration of all schools within the school district" by a vote of 19,470 to 7,565, the four public

high schools in Little Rock remained closed throughout the 1958-59 school year. Leaders of the WEC were encouraged by the 7,500 affirmative votes cast in the referendum, the first attempt by the committee to enter an electoral contest.

CLOSED PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The governor's proclamation closing the city's four high schools, issued under authority of Act 4 of 1958, was delivered to the superintendent of schools by state policemen early on the morning of September 13, 1958. Closing the high schools interrupted the education of approximately 3,400 children. Of these, more than 2,200 attended city private schools, transferred to public schools in other places, or enrolled in correspondence courses; but at least 675 senior high school children received no schooling of any kind during the academic year 1958-59. To prevent disbandment of the high school teaching and administrative staffs, the school board continued the payment of salaries to regular employees, amounting to \$720,000 during the academic year.

About 900 white students enrolled in the Raney High School, the make-shift school run for whites only by the Little Rock Private School Corporation, incorporated in September, 1958.*

The defeat of Congressman Brooks Hays, a veteran of eight terms, for renomination, by Dr. Dale Alford confirmed the long-standing inclination of five moderate members of the Little Rock school board to resign. An eye specialist, a segregationist, and a newcomer to state politics, Alford was elected by write-in votes at the general election on November 4. A surprise candidate, running as an independent with the tacit support of Governor Faubus, Alford defeated Hays, a moderate in his stand in integration in a whirlwind campaign of only six days. The vote for Alford in the city of Little Rock was 12,658 to 11,783.

On November 10, the United States Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals ordered the Little Rock school board to initiate positive steps to comply with its plan of gradual integration of the public schools. Five members of the school board resigned two days later. These five described their position as one of "utter hopelessness, helplessness, and frustration." Dr. Alford was the sole member of the Little Rock school board from November 12 until his term expired on December 6.

DEADLOCK

Moderates in Little Rock nominated five candidates for election to the school board at the regular school election on December 6, 1958. The five were persuaded to seek membership by officials of the Little Rock Chamber

* The Board of Directors of the corporation announced early in the spring of 1959 that the private school would reopen in September in a new plant with a capacity of 1,500 students. On August 4, 1959—more than two months after the recall election—the Board of Directors of the corporation announced that an anticipated lack of funds precluded the scheduled reopening of school.

of Commerce. Petitions to nominate these five, signed at the last moment by members of the Women's Emergency Committee to Open Our Schools, were filed just prior to the legal deadline. The committee actively campaigned in support of these candidates who, fearful of "guilt by association," were unable politically to acknowledge its support or even to be remotely identified with the organization.

The segregationists nominated two slates. Schism within the Little Rock Capital Citizens' Council, created by an undisclosed issue which the leaders could not otherwise resolve, had resulted during June, 1958, in the formal expulsion of three members who, with about fifteen others who resigned, organized the States' Rights Council. This in turn led to rival segregationist slates of candidates for membership on the school board, the split vote of segregationists, the election of two moderates, Lamb and Tucker, by pluralities, and an evenly-divided and deadlocked school board. A third moderate, Matson, defeated a single candidate nominated by the Capital Citizens' Council. Six candidates were named by the Capital Citizens' Council, two candidates by the States' Rights Council. The two slates divided the vote of the segregationists, and two of the three moderates elected polled only a plurality of the votes cast. Three of the six elected to the school board were segregationists: Robert W. Laster, Ed I. McKinley, Jr., and Ben D. Rowland, Sr., all attorneys. Three of the six were moderates: Ted L. Lamb, head of an advertising firm; Russell H. Matson, Jr., a building contractor; and Everett Tucker, Jr., executive director of the Industrial Development Company, owner and operator of the Little Rock Industrial District. The election of the three moderates to the school board, from a slate branded as "integregationist" by the governor, was the first significant rebuff at the polls of segregationists in Little Rock.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

A majority of the parents of the 1,404 children enrolled in the highest grade in the city's junior high schools at the end of the 1958-59 school year were eager for the closed schools to be opened. Business and professional groups, aware that no major and few, if any, petty industries had located within the city since September, 1957, were eager for the schools to open.

E. Granger Williams, an insurance executive, became president of the Little Rock Chamber of Commerce early in 1959. His moderate attitude, in contrast to the policies of his immediate predecessors, was generally known when he assumed office. Williams had been named fourth vice president in 1955 and, in keeping with precedent, had been advanced step by step in each succeeding year to the highest office in the organization—and to a position of leadership in the community.

Officials of the Chamber of Commerce conducted a formal poll by mail of the organization's entire membership in February, 1959. Two questions were asked:

1. "Do you favor Little Rock's continuing with closed public high schools?"
 2. "Do you now favor the reopening of Little Rock's public high schools on a controlled minimum plan of integration acceptable to the Federal courts?"
-

Replies to the first question were: Yes, 230; No, 632; Not voting, 285. Replies to the second question were: Yes, 819; No, 245; Not voting, 83. The Board of Directors of the Chamber, encouraged by results of their poll—and, in some instances, individually urged by members of the WEC—unanimously approved a formal resolution at their regular meeting, March 23, stating:

The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, however much we dislike it, is the declared law and is binding upon us. We think that the decision was erroneous and that it was a reversal of established law upon an unprecedented basis of psychology and sociology. But we must in honesty recognize that, because the Supreme Court is the court of last resort in this country, what it has said must stand until there is a correcting constitutional amendment or until the Court corrects its own error.

The resolution urged “the reopening of the Little Rock high schools by using a pupil placement system acceptable to the school board and the Federal courts” and, taking cognizance of rumors that segregationist groups were opposing renewal of the contracts of some teachers, further urged the school board to assure “all teachers that their contracts will be promptly renewed; in order that we do not lose our valuable and loyal staff.”

THE RENEWAL OF TEACHERS' CONTRACTS

It was realized by all those who desired the reopening of the schools that steps must be taken soon to hold together the teachers and other employees of the high schools. On February 6, the WEC by resolution formally had urged the school board immediately to renew the contracts of all high school teachers. Resolutions of the WEC and of the Chamber of Commerce were prompted by rumors, increasingly persistent during the fall and winter of 1958, that renewal of the contracts of some teachers, particularly at Central High School, was opposed by segregationist groups. Persistence of these rumors threatened seriously to impair teacher morale.

Some segregationist leaders immediately opposed the renewal of the contracts of a few teachers at Central High School. They alleged that these teachers had displayed favoritism toward Negro students during the 1957-58 school year. A petition requesting the school board to dismiss the principal of Central High School, circulated during that year by the Mothers' League, accused him of discrimination against white students. Governor Faubus, on February 9, 1959, told newsmen that the principal and the two vice principals at the school, at the direction of the superintendent, “did everything they could to discriminate against white students. . . .” The governor added that if he were a member of the school board “there are some teachers I would not rehire under any conditions.” One member of the school board, Rowland, on the following day said that he, Laster, and McKinley felt that the three principals mentioned by the governor and “probably a few others” should not be reemployed, because of “their views on integration and segregation.”

THE PURGE

Statutes of Arkansas stipulated that the annual contract of a public school teacher would be automatically renewed at the existing rate of salary at the end of ten days following a school year in event the teacher had not resigned, been discharged, or been reemployed. An administrative rule of the Little Rock school board, in effect for a decade and last published in booklet form in September, 1955, required the superintendent to give oral notice by January 15 to any teacher whose removal was contemplated. This notice spelled out the particulars of the teacher's alleged incompetency; if these were not corrected within a reasonable period in the judgment of the superintendent, the retention or dismissal of the teacher was referred for an advisory opinion to a "welfare committee" consisting chiefly of fellow teachers. A teacher thereafter discharged by the superintendent must be so notified in writing not later than March 15 and may appeal to the school board for a hearing to be held during the last fifteen days of March.

The annual renewal of teacher contracts was on the agenda of the regular meeting of the school board in April. This meeting was postponed until May 5 as two members were out of the city. Although the school board could not foresee definitely whether it would have or lack legal authority to open the closed high schools until pending litigation in federal courts challenging the constitutionality of Act 4 of 1958 had been decided, moderates on the board were eager to bolster sagging teacher morale by prompt renewal of all contracts recommended by the superintendent.

The meeting of the school board on Tuesday, May 5, convened at 9:00 A.M. at the administrative offices of the school district in downtown Little Rock. All members were present. An unusually large number of spectators included representatives of several teacher organizations, WEC, Mothers' League, League of Women Voters of Little Rock. Dr. Malcolm G. Taylor and Amis Guthridge were in the audience. Moderates on the board first suspected that the renewal of some contracts was to be opposed during the meeting when, immediately prior to the session in the privacy of the men's room, Tucker was informed by Terrell Powell, superintendent of schools, that he planned to submit his resignation during the meeting at the request of segregationists on the board. Tucker asked Powell not to resign.

After convening, the board, with McKinley presiding, voted three to three on a motion not to renew the contract of Superintendent Powell. McKinley ruled, on the basis of an opinion rendered in 1958 by the attorney general, that Powell was removed, since renewal of his contract required approval by a majority. The board then voted three to three on a motion by Lamb that contracts of all teachers recommended by the superintendent be renewed; and voted similarly on a motion by Rowland that contracts of all teachers in any school closed for any reason including "forced integration" automatically be terminated. Other three to three votes followed on both substantive and procedural motions. The session recessed for lunch at about 11:00 A.M.

Lamb, Matson, and Tucker, in keeping with a commitment to the local Classroom Teachers Association, steadfastly refused to consider the renewal

of contracts of individual teachers or of teachers in a particular school. This commitment obligated these three to vote against a motion to renew any contract unless the motion included the renewal of all contracts recommended by the superintendent.

The board reconvened at 1:00 P.M. Tucker then read a statement, drafted during the lunch period, favoring the "reemployment of all personnel recommended by the school superintendent." The statement concluded:

We are now withdrawing from this meeting and declaring that no quorum exists upon our withdrawal.

After departure of the three moderates, McKinley asked the recording secretary to include two rulings in the minutes: the ten year old administrative rule described above, governing the removal of teachers, was not in effect, since it had never been expressly adopted by the existing board; a quorum of the board was present during the afternoon, since a quorum was in attendance when the meeting began. After an executive session of ten minutes, spectators and newsmen were invited to return. McKinley announced that consideration of teacher contracts was next on the order of business. Laster's motion that contracts be considered on the basis of individual teachers, beginning with the high schools, carried. The first motion was against the renewal of the contract of the principal at Central High School; the second, against renewal of the contract of the vice principal for girls at the same school. Both were approved. These two and 42 other similar motions were approved in three open sessions sandwiched between closed executive sessions that lasted until 6:30 P.M. Laster and Rowland alternately offered and seconded these motions and McKinley directed the recording secretary to record his vote in the affirmative. Also approved were motions to: renew the contracts of 764 teachers and other school employees; employ T. H. Alford, father of Dr. Dale Alford, as superintendent; reduce the rate of the district property tax by three mills; raise all teacher salaries by five percent in event revenues during the 1959-60 school year were sufficient; schedule a meeting of the school board at 3:00 P.M. the following day—a meeting cancelled without explanation earlier on that afternoon.

Of those whose contracts were not renewed 39 were white and 5 were Negro; 27 were employed at Central High School, and the remaining 17 at ten other schools; the group included 7 principals, 34 classroom teachers, and three other employees. Letters, signed by Laster, McKinley, and Rowland, were sent that evening by registered mail to each of the dismissed employees. These letters declared:

You are hereby notified that your contract with the Board of Education, Little Rock School district, has not been, and will not be, renewed for the 1959-60 school year.

Among spectators present at all open sessions of the school board throughout the day was Mrs. Gordon N. Wilson, president of the Parent-Teacher Association at the Forest Park Elementary School, representing the WEC. Mrs. Wilson at intervals during the afternoon reported proceedings of the meeting by telephone to the home of Mrs. Terry where a regular monthly

meeting of the WEC executive board was in session. Resenting the dismissal of principals at two schools attended by her children, Mrs. Wilson interrupted proceedings during the afternoon to demand from the floor: "On what basis were they dismissed, may I ask?" McKinley explained that "at this time we are not open to discussion from the floor."

The three moderates on the board had "walked out" of the meeting on the advice of attorneys. Tucker later explained that "by our leaving the dismissed teachers would be in a better position for litigation." The strategy of the "walkout" arose out of the commitment of the moderates to the Classroom Teachers Association, which obligated them to vote against any motion which did not include the contracts of all teachers recommended by the superintendent. The legal strategy of the walkout rested on the assumption that the dismissal of an individual teacher would result when a motion to renew his contract failed to carry. It was also deemed better to avoid voting entirely than to run the risk of inadvertently or accidentally dismissing any teacher. This could arise because the members were polled alphabetically, and the first vote would be cast by Lamb. His vote against renewal of the contract of any individual plus the negative votes of the three segregationist members would accomplish the legal dismissal of the individual by a vote of four to two. Matson and Tucker, voting after Laster, could only become aware that the dismissal of any individual was intended by the three segregationists when Laster, casting his vote immediately after Lamb, also voted in the negative.

Each of the 44 dismissed employees continued to perform his duties; no one of the 764 reemployed employees, on the advice of attorneys, signed the contracts tendered them.

The dismissals evoked sharp criticism and vigorous support. Dr. Alford, then in Little Rock because of an illness in his family, defended the dismissals. "I was informed," he declared in a statement given to newsmen, "that the board . . . had reliable evidence to substantiate their action." This evidence, much of it presented by segregationist leaders at meetings held over a three day period prior to May 5 and attended by Laster, McKinley, and Rowland, indicated that several teachers at Central High School during the 1957-58 school term had disciplined white students for allegedly aggressive acts or statements directed at Negro students. Four white and one Negro student at the school had been expelled during that school year and "about one hundred" white students had been suspended temporarily. Some of the disciplined white students, their parents, and many others were convinced that a few administrators and teachers had "discriminated against white students." Other dismissed Central High School teachers in voluntary interviews during February, 1958, conducted at the request of a committee of the Arkansas Legislative Council, had expressed the opinion that integration at the school might have been more successful had a much larger number of Negro students been enrolled. Transcripts of these interviews were made available to segregationist members of the school board.

McKinley explained that "a large number" of the dismissed teachers had been removed because "they are integrationist or they collaborated with integrationists." "About half a dozen," he said, were dismissed "for other

HUNT LIBRARY
CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIVERSITY
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15213

reasons." McKinley pointed to the fact that voters in recent elections had indicated opposition to school integration; declared that most parents did not want their children instructed by teachers who condoned school integration. In a radio and television program, McKinley subsequently stated that teachers believing "that the United States Supreme Court has the lawful right to amend the Constitution . . . have no place in our school system, however qualified otherwise." Governor Faubus, on May 6, declared that the school board had not consulted with him and "as far as I know, they are acting on their own. . . ."

"In no instance," alleged Eugene R. Warren, attorney representing the dismissed white teachers, was a removal "recommended by either the principal or superintendent of the school in which he or she taught." This attorney claimed that "It is common gossip that the reasons for most of the firings . . . are personal and frivolous. In many instances the action was taken to please friends and political cohorts." He promised to "prove in court" that dismissals in some instances rested on complaints by parents that their children had been given low grades unfairly. An editorial in the *Arkansas Democrat*, less critical of the dismissals than was the *Arkansas Gazette*, stated:

Reasons are not entirely clear as to why some of the teachers were not rehired. Certainly, none should be refused a contract for exercising his or her constitutional right of free speech, outside the classrooms, even on integration.

POPULAR REACTION

The WEC was the first organization in the city formally to condemn the dismissals. Mrs. Brewer, advised promptly by telephone of the school board's action, reported in a "tremulous voice" to members of the committee's executive board, in session at the home of Mrs. Terry, that the "school board is firing our teachers right and left." Members voted immediately to authorize Mrs. Brewer and the executive committee of the board "to do whatever is possible to save our fine staff of teachers" and, at the suggestion of their president, voted their confidence in and support of the school teachers of Little Rock.

The executive committee of the local branch of the American Association of University Women characterized the dismissals as "un-American" and, in letters to all principals and teachers, declared: "We can only assume that this action . . . is aimed at weakening and destroying the Little Rock school system by this added indignity to a loyal, highly qualified, dedicated school staff." The executive director of the Arkansas Education Association promised prompt legal action challenging the legality of the dismissals. The board of the Department of Classroom Teachers voiced concern "not only because the personal and professional rights of individual teachers have been violated, but also because such high-handed procedures as those used by the three Little Rock School Board members constitute a threat to the whole teaching profession."

There were units of the Parent-Teacher Association in 26 of the public schools of Little Rock in May, 1959. Membership totalled 13,000. A hastily

convened meeting on May 6 of the executive committee of the council of this organization adopted without dissent a resolution critical of the three segregationists on the school board for "attempting summary dismissal of school personnel without cause." "We feel," the resolution continued, "that board members who attempt such high-handed tactics are not qualified to hold offices of such responsibility. . . ." The resolution urged voters of the school district to consider carefully "all legal measures allowed by Arkansas law to achieve recall of officials who use their positions to jeopardize our public school system." The Greater Little Rock Ministerial Alliance and the League of Women Voters joined the protest. An editorial in the *Arkansas Baptist* commented: "At long last there is real evidence that the people of the city have had enough."

ORIGINS OF THE RECALL

By chance two close friends met in a downtown cafe at noon on May 6. They agreed during luncheon that the sharp public reaction to dismissal of the 44 school employees evidenced a popular resentment favorable to the immediate initiation of the recall of Laster, McKinley, and Rowland. Each had similar conversations, in person or by telephone, with close personal friends during the afternoon and, upon initiative and invitation of one of the two, a group of five met late that afternoon. Three of the five were attorneys, junior members of established law firms; one was a realtor; the last an executive of a building and loan association. All had been personal friends for years. They drafted the text of a resolution calling for the circulation of petitions for the recall of Laster, McKinley, and Rowland. Then they arranged to have the resolution presented to the meeting of the PTA of the Forest Park Elementary School, scheduled for the evening of May 6. G. Thomas Eisele, an attorney and patron of the school, agreed to introduce the resolution. They also agreed to meet for coffee on the following morning at Breier's, and planned a larger meeting for the following afternoon at the Grady Manning Hotel.

THE FOREST PARK PTA MEETING

The campaign to recall the segregationist members of the school board was launched publicly on the evening of Wednesday, May 6, at a membership meeting of the PTA unit of the Forest Park Elementary School. The school, in western Little Rock, was attended by children of parents in relatively high income brackets. Mrs. Gordon N. Wilson was president of the unit and Dr. Drew F. Agar, a specialist in internal medicine and father of three children attending the school, vice president and also president of the school's "Dad's Club." The school's principal, among the 44 dismissed employees, was Mrs. Frances Sue Wood, principal for seven years and an employee of the school system for 29 years. Mrs. Wilson, in announcing the meeting, reported that "several parents wanted me to call a special PTA meeting to give Mrs. Wood a vote of confidence." Dr. Agar, describing himself as a "political neophyte" and an "outraged citizen," told newsmen that the meeting

was being called to protest the action of the three members of the school board who voted not to renew Mrs. Wood's contract. Dr. Agar urged his friends to attend the meeting and hundreds of others were invited by means of the WEC telephone chain. There were about 400 in the school's auditorium at 7:30 P.M.

The meeting unanimously adopted formal resolutions to commend Mrs. Wood, to question the legality of the dismissals, and to condemn Laster, McKinley, and Rowland. At this juncture the meeting was declared to be one of patrons of the school rather than of the PTA unit group, and Dr. Agar, at the request of Mrs. Wilson, presided as chairman. G. Thomas Eisele then read the text of a prepared resolution calling for the preparation and circulation of petitions by patrons of the school for the recall of Laster, McKinley, and Rowland to the end that teachers "be forever protected in their just rights and expectations." The suggestion that the attempt to invoke the recall be limited to only one of the three, the member regarded as politically the most vulnerable, was discussed and discarded. The meeting then approved the resolution as offered by Eisele without a dissenting vote, "amid resounding applause and cheering."

On the following morning, Dr. Agar named a three woman committee to plan and to direct the circulation of recall petitions, and during the afternoon 500 of 3,000 petitions were delivered to the committee. Women volunteers, recruited and assigned to small areas by the committee, circulated petitions in the neighborhood of the Forest Park Elementary School during the evening, two days after the "rump session" of the school board voted not to renew the 44 contracts. Dr. Agar, predicting optimistically that the required number of signatures would be obtained "in a week or ten days," reported that "the indignation that I have had expressed to me personally and through contacts of mine assure me that there will be no trouble in obtaining . . . signatures." Two days later, the WEC, having obtained copies of the petitions from Dr. Agar, set up temporary headquarters at the home of a member and assumed responsibility for planning and implementing the methodical circulation of petitions in other areas throughout the school district.

THE EVENTS OF MAY 7

The president of the Little Rock Chamber of Commerce on the morning of May 7 characterised the dismissals as "unfair, not only to those who have been purged, but removes any feeling of security among those who are left." A meeting of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce, held later the same morning and attended by 19 of its 25 members, unanimously resolved:

The attempted dismissal of these public servants, without explanation, announced reason or cause, and, equally important, without affording the teachers an opportunity of defense, is without precedent. This abortive abuse of power is . . . without honor and human decency, and is a disgrace to this community. We urge the people of Little Rock, as individuals and as groups interested in the integrity, character and self-respect of this city, to join with us in demanding that this attempted purge be erased.

The president of the Little Rock school board described the dismissals as an "extraneous academic issue" and, in a public statement on May 9, declared: "We have been somewhat surprised by the public furor that a few small groups are attempting to whip up over the dismissal of the 44 employees." Later, over radio and television, he characterized the "public furor" as a "sinister fiction of a well-laid and diabolical plan to move integration into Little Rock through an apparent defense of the teachers." At a press conference Amis Guthridge told newsmen that the present uproar has "just brought the integrationists out in the open. For a long time around here the only integrationist was Daisy Bates (President of the NAACP in Arkansas). She didn't make any bones about where she stood. Now all these others have been flushed out into the open." Mrs. Jackson criticized those "defending teachers who received dismissal notices without hearing the reasons for their dismissals." Other local segregationist leaders, prompted by the popular condemnation, suspected that the dismissals, as subsequently labeled by a correspondent of the *New York Times*, had been a "tactical blunder." The governor told his press conference that "the school board impasse is strictly up to the board"; but he did not view the dismissals as a "mass firing" since "you can't say 'mass' when you are talking about 40 or so out of 800 school teachers."

While the meeting of the board of directors of the Little Rock Chamber of Commerce was in session on May 7, a group of seven young men had coffee at Breier's "Fine Old Restaurant." These young men, the five who had drafted the resolution adopted at Forest Park the night before, and a feature writer of the *Arkansas Gazette* and another, made preliminary plans for the creation of an organization to initiate and bring about the recall of Laster, McKinley, and Rowland. At their meeting at Breier's they gave the proposed organization a tentative name, STOP (Stop This Outrageous Purge), suggested by the *Arkansas Gazette* writer. The seven young men were college graduates, from high-income families, active in local professional and social organizations, and—with one exception—members of the Democratic party and natives of Arkansas. One was legal adviser of the WEC, which, according to one of its members, had "talked about the recall at every meeting for months." When they learned by telephone of the substance of the formal resolution adopted on that morning by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce, the group at Breier's, feeling assured of moral and financial support by those whom they regarded as the influential individuals in the community, resolved to go ahead with the formation of an *ad hoc* citizens' organization to campaign for the recall of the three segregationists on the school board.

About 25 persons, including representatives of the Chamber of Commerce and the local AFL-CIO, attended the afternoon meeting at the Grady Manning. William S. Mitchell, an attorney of Little Rock, was present. No reporters were in attendance. Sponsors felt that their contemplated use of the recall, if publicized, might elicit pressures sufficient to stifle the attempt. It was agreed at the meeting that: an *ad hoc* citizens' committee, to be christened "STOP," would be created to sponsor, manage, and finance the recall campaign; STOP would be established formally at a publicized meeting at 4:00

P.M. on the following day at the civic hall of the Union National Bank; temporary chairman of the meeting would be W. P. Hamilton, Jr., an attorney; permanent chairman would be Dr. Agar. Component divisions of STOP and division leaders were discussed, as were ways and means of financing the recall campaign. Those present were urged to invite others to attend the organizational meeting and primary responsibility for invitations was assigned to one person who, with a trio invited to his home, prepared a list during that evening of others to be invited by telephone.

PTA FORGES AHEAD

The action of the PTA did not wait upon the creation of a formal organization to campaign for recall. On May 7, the sixty-member executive board of the Little Rock PTA voted 41 to 9 to approve a recall resolution and, without dissent, also voted to refer the question of formal censure and the issue of removal by recall to the 26 unit groups in the city. Eighteen of the units endorsed both the recommendation of censure and the recall; three units approved censure but disapproved recall; two units disapproved both censure and recall; two others refused to take any action; and one unit group held no meeting.

Most unit group meetings of the PTA, held in public school auditoriums or cafeterias, were well attended; feeling at some was high pitched. The WEC and segregationist organizations encouraged their members to attend. Efforts by the WEC to "pack" these unit group meetings, facilitated by its efficient telephone chain, were effective. Spokesmen for moderates usually had a friendly audience; spokesmen for segregationists, an unsympathetic and at times hostile audience. In several instances the WEC not only helped to encourage attendance, it also supplied competent and "appropriate" chairmen. A prominent segregationist, member of the board of directors of the Raney High School, literally was "shouldered" from the speaker's stand at Forest Heights Junior High School by the chairman, an attorney, whose ruling that the speaker's lengthy and rambling remarks were not pertinent to a pending motion was overwhelmingly upheld by the audience. Amis Guthridge characterized these unit meetings as "rigged Communist-like demonstrations." Guthridge attended a joint unit meeting of the Pulaski Heights Elementary and Junior High Schools, but did not address an unsympathetic audience of over 800, although he had announced two days earlier that he planned to use the occasion to "name names among the school teachers whose contracts were not renewed and reveal the subversive organizations to which some belonged . . ." and identify "Communist-fronters . . . now in Little Rock helping Daisy Bates and the Womens' Emergency Committee and the Chamber of Commerce. . . . to race-mix our schools."

Lamb told a patrons' meeting at the Williams Elementary School that the issue raised by the dismissal of school employees involved more than the interests of 44 teachers. "The entire public school system," he said, "is at stake." Tucker on the same occasion said that "integration is most distasteful to me personally, but I can see no prospect for public schools without integration. Closed schools are too high a price to pay." The 355 persons

present unanimously adopted a resolution endorsing the recall of Laster, McKinley, and Rowland and, after adjournment, many signed recall petitions which at this time were in limited circulation.

STOP

The organizational meeting of the Committee to Stop This Outrageous Purge, held subsequent to the actual circulation of recall petitions by patrons of the Forest Park Elementary School, was attended by few of the business and professional leaders of the community. Many of the largest businesses of the community and all of the banks were represented, but, in most instances, by junior executives or by relatives of senior executives. A state senator and three members of the House of Representatives of the Arkansas legislature attended. The purpose of the meeting, carefully and precisely spelled out by Dr. Agar, was limited specifically to the "organization of opposition" to the dismissal of 44 school employees by formation of an *ad hoc* citizens' committee to seek removal of Laster, McKinley, and Rowland by the recall. Recall petitions were distributed and over \$6,000 in cash and pledges was contributed to defray expenses of the recall campaign. A statement of principles, unanimously adopted by the 179 persons in attendance—and subsequently signed by about 40 others—declared:

1. We oppose the action taken by three members of the Little Rock school board in attempting to discharge teachers without giving them notice or a fair and impartial hearing.
2. We believe the action of these three men constitutes a denial of basic rights to employees of our schools and will cause irreparable damage to our public school system by destroying academic freedom and the faith of our teachers in themselves as free citizens.
3. We characterize the action taken by these three men as a purge which was cynical and designed to create fear that stalks the classrooms.
4. The actions taken by Ben D. Rowland, Ed I. McKinley, Jr., and Robert W. Laster are a breach of public trust and justify their recall as members of the Little Rock school board.

STOP recruited the services of a veteran political strategist, Henry Woods, law partner of former Governor Sidney McMath and manager of four state-wide political campaigns for McMath, and also of a publicity and public relations consultant, a former resident of Little Rock. STOP had no board of directors. Funds of the organization, held in a single account, were disbursed by one of three individuals. Dr. Agar was only titular chairman. Some portion of a 26 member "advisory committee," named by Dr. Agar on May 16 to borrow their individual and collective prestige, held only one meeting, on May 17, to select William S. Mitchell as campaign chairman. The advisory committee then fell apart.

Mitchell, in 1959 a member of the executive committee of the Arkansas Bar Association, was a life-long resident of Little Rock.* His selection as campaign chairman reflected his aloofness from factional alignments at state

* In June, 1960, Mr. Mitchell was elected President of the Arkansas Bar Association.

and local levels. Known as a moderate, Mitchell, as acting chancellor, had demonstrated impartiality by upholding the legality of Act 4 of 1958 in the original litigation challenging its constitutionality in state courts. He devoted full time to his duties as campaign chairman.

The recall campaign of STOP was directed by an informal campaign committee with a hard core of four members: Mitchell; Henry Woods; Boyd Ridgeway, executive vice president and executive director of the Little Rock Chamber of Commerce; and an executive officer of a Little Rock bank. These four were joined by others at different times: representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO, moderates on the school board. Forrest Rozzell, executive director of the Arkansas Education Association, actively supported STOP and frequently attended meetings of the campaign committee. No one of the group of young men, instigators of STOP and of the recall, served regularly on the campaign committee. The committee was not formally established, and received no formal delegation of authority. It met often and, during the closing days of the recall campaign, almost continuously. It was the policy making and the executive organ of STOP. One member of the campaign committee served as finance chairman; two, including Henry Woods, designed the internal structure of STOP; one assumed responsibility for "getting out" the Negro vote. The members of STOP were invited by mail to one general meeting, held a week after the organizational meeting, to raise additional campaign funds.

Backstage, the STOP campaign committee had the services of Hugh Patterson and Harry Ashmore, publisher and editor of the *Arkansas Gazette*, and Sidney S. McMath, Governor of Arkansas from 1949 through 1952. Patterson and Ashmore participated in every major decision and prepared much of the material used by STOP spokesmen. They stayed in the background, for obvious tactical reasons, when WEC and the Chamber of Commerce and other respectable groups adopted the position the *Gazette* had espoused editorially from the beginning of the segregation crisis. Since 1957 the *Gazette* had attracted to itself the implacable hostility of the segregationists and had suffered severe economic losses in competition with the *Arkansas Democrat*. During the whole period the pages of the *Gazette* provided the rallying point and guiding spirit for the WEC, for the business groups which finally recognized that the situation was intolerable in economic terms, and for the educational groups which joined forces in STOP to reopen the schools. Patterson and Ashmore, delighted to have company at last, were perfectly willing to stay out of sight and let new men carry on the fight publicly and take credit for the victory.

STOP opened an office on May 9 in the Pyramid Life Building. A more elaborate first floor office and headquarters was opened on May 13 on Center Street. The campaign committee occupied additional offices in the Gleason Hotel. The office of the WEC in Pulaski Heights, in western Little Rock, was thought by many newsmen and other visitors to be an office of STOP.

The membership of STOP, overlapping more with the Chamber of Commerce than with any other organization, endowed with prestige the attempt to recall Laster, McKinley, and Rowland and assured adequate financial

support. Responsibility for recruitment and immediate circulation of campaign workers at the grass roots level was assumed by the WEC.

CIRCULATION OF PETITIONS

Uncertain of the number of names legally required to invoke the recall, STOP, making allowance for a liberal margin of safety, undertook to obtain the signatures of 7,500 voters. Since the segregationists were sponsoring counter recall petitions, STOP workers were eager to file their petitions first because of the uncertain meaning of the enabling act limiting to one the number of recall elections held in a single school year.

Circulators of STOP petitions and of counter recall petitions made especially vigorous efforts to obtain signatures on Sunday, May 10. Circulators went from house to house and, during the afternoon, other circulators at strategic locations flagged passing motorists. STOP operated a "drive in" office—complete with tables, chairs, and notaries—on a corner of the parking area at War Memorial Stadium. The Mothers' League operated a similar "drive in" near the entrance of the Arkansas Livestock Show grounds. By evening the petitions circulated by STOP contained 6,000 signatures.

Visitors at Dr. Agar's home on this Sunday afternoon formulated plans for a meeting of STOP workers at 10:00 A.M. on the following day at the Marion Hotel to seek the 1,500 needed signatures. Some members of the WEC met during the evening to designate desirable locations for the assignment of circulators—post offices, supermarkets, banks, restaurants, shopping centers, downtown stores, office buildings—and, on a card for each location, assigned members to circulate petitions at that location during specified hours on Monday afternoon. About 400 persons, most of them members of the WEC, attended the meeting for STOP workers at the Marion Hotel. At the meeting, 388 women—and some of their husbands—were assigned as circulators on the basis of plans made the preceding evening by members of WEC. Petitions turned in on Monday to STOP offices brought total signatures to 8,600. Photostatic copies of each sheet of the STOP petitions were made on Sunday and Monday. More than 7,000 of the signatures on these petitions were checked against names in official poll books between 7:00 P.M. and midnight on Sunday by 25 WEC members with the help of some husbands. STOP petitions, containing 9,603 signatures, were filed formally at offices of the county clerk shortly before 9:00 A.M. on Tuesday, May 12. The filing was viewed by women spectators recruited for the occasion by the WEC at the request of STOP for the benefit of newspaper photographers and television viewers. The smiling spectators, some with infants in arms, were representatives of the League of Women Voters, American Association of University Women, and the Parent-Teacher Association. All were members of WEC.

CROSS

While speaking to the patrons' meeting at the Forest Park Elementary School on May 6, Eisele had predicted circulation by segregationists of

counter recall petitions to remove Lamb, Matson, and Tucker. Matson had assured the same audience that moderates on the school board, in that event, would stand for reelection "if we're assured of financial and moral support." Dr. Malcolm G. Taylor, president of the Citizens' Council, in a public statement on May 7 had observed that the "walkout" of the three moderate members of the school board "displayed an emotional instability which indicates their unfitness to be members of the federally harassed school board." Counter recall petitions were circulated in Little Rock by members of the Mothers' League on the afternoon of May 9. Petitions were distributed to circulators and their activities were directed from the home of Mrs. Jackson. Predicting that sufficient signatures would be secured "by the middle of the week," Mrs. Jackson urged "all patriotic citizens who believe in states' rights, constitutional government and racial integrity to secure a petition, sign it, and circulate it as soon as possible." Original counter petitions, signed by 7,250 voters, were filed by Mrs. Jackson at offices of the county clerk at 4:25 P.M. on Tuesday, May 12, seven hours after the filing of STOP petitions. Supplementary petitions with 504 signatures were accepted by the county clerk from Mrs. Jackson later on the same day. The Mothers' League secured 7,754 signatures in less than four full days and "all we had," explained Mrs. Jackson, "was a lot of sincere people with a cause to work for." The Mothers' League had the advantage of recent experience in the circulation of recall petitions; in September, 1958, they initiated an attempt—subsequently abandoned—to remove five incumbents from the school board.

The existence of CROSS (Committee to Retain Our Segregated Schools) was announced on May 16 by Reverend M. L. Moser, Jr., pastor of the Central Missionary Baptist Church, Little Rock. CROSS, Moser said, had no connection with any other organization; it was established to cooperate in efforts to recall Lamb, Matson, and Tucker. Creation of CROSS was imperative, Moser declared, because "we could lose this fight by default if we sit back and permit the integrationists or the so-called moderates to do all the talking." Counter recall petitions had been filed and certified as sufficient by the county clerk two days before the existence of CROSS was made public.

CROSS had no formal officers, no roll of members. Its founder was its *de facto* chairman. Its name was suggested by J. Phil Stratton, editor and publisher of the short-lived *States' Rights Digest* and formerly administrative assistant in the office of Governor Faubus. After May 17, CROSS retained as public relations and publicity consultant an advertising firm employed regularly by several administrative agencies of the state government. A headquarters was opened May 18 on Scott Street. CROSS had a founder and chairman, a name, a headquarters, an advertising agency, the support of Governor Faubus, little else. Leadership in the campaign to recall Lamb, Matson, and Tucker was supplied by established leaders of the Capital Citizens' Council; volunteer workers at ward and precinct levels were recruited by the Mothers' League. No other organizations in Little Rock, with the exception of the States' Rights Council and the locals of four labor organizations, publicly endorsed CROSS. The Klan, not a factor in the recall campaign, did make its existence known by the appearance on May 16 and 17 of recruiting posters in Little Rock and elsewhere in the state and, on

the end of the "drive in" office of STOP at War Memorial Stadium.

ISSUES

Members of the school board, five months and nineteen days after their election, faced removal in a recall election that involved a confusion of issues. The only issue at stake, insisted STOP, was the "blatant disregard of the rights of some school teachers and administrators. . . ." The only issue at stake, insisted CROSS, was "just another fight between integrationists and segregationists." The confusion of issues was reflected by an editorial in the *Arkansas Democrat* which urged support for STOP and stated that the recall election hinged "on a problem within a problem." Spokesmen for STOP rarely undertook to defend token integration in public schools; spokesmen for CROSS rarely undertook to defend the discharge of school employees.

Thus, issues at stake in the election were rarely joined. Spokesmen for STOP and CROSS initiated their election campaigns at different locations; developed them in different directions. Spokesmen for STOP expanded defense of the dismissed teachers into defense of all public school teachers, the system of public schools, public education, academic freedom, economic development of the community. Spokesmen for CROSS expanded defense of school segregation into defense of racial integrity, states' rights, constitutional government, free enterprise.

Spokesmen for STOP and CROSS belittled the goals of their opponents. Dr. Agar, referring to signers of counter recall petitions, observed: "The people who actually signed these petitions obviously favor the shabby treatment handed 44 dedicated teachers. . . ." Mrs. Jackson charged that "this thing about the teachers" was "something that they and the *Arkansas Gazette* have blown up to try to hoodwink the people into accepting integration." "Never," she observed, "have the integrationists been so successful in disguising their real purpose."

Expanding upon the theme of Mrs. Jackson's comment, Governor Faubus on the evening prior to the recall election accused STOP of a "sinister conspiracy" and insisted that the dismissal of school employees could have been prevented by Lamb, Matson, and Tucker if they had remained at the meeting of the school board on May 5. Their three votes, he explained, would have precluded any action and, by statute, the contracts of the 44 school employees automatically would have been renewed. "Could this . . . walk out," he asked, "have been a maneuver to have teachers as an issue?"

It is probable that the choice offered voters in the recall election was described most accurately by Tucker on the day following the dismissals: "Operate the schools as per some court-approved plan or depend upon private schools."

CAMPAIGN

The county clerk of Pulaski County completed his count of signatures on both petitions at 1:30 P.M. on May 14. In a letter sent immediately by

registered mail to the county board of election commissioners, he certified to the sufficiency—but not to the number—of signatures on STOP and on CROSS petitions. Upon receipt of this letter, the county board of election commissioners on May 15 authorized the sheriff to announce by proclamation that the recall election would be held on May 25. The proclamation of the sheriff also specified 31 polling places, 29 in and 2 outside of the city.

Ward and Precinct

A meeting of prospective campaign workers for STOP, on the morning of May 18 at the Marion Hotel, was attended by approximately 70 persons, most of them recruited two days before by means of WEC's telephone chain. From a list of nominees prepared the day before by the WEC, Dr. Agar named a precinct secretary for each polling place within the school district. All precinct secretaries were members of WEC. Those in attendance broke up into five ward groups and each ward group was informed by its STOP liaison officer, named by and from the membership of WEC, of the structure and plan of operations at ward and precinct levels contemplated by STOP. Each ward group was advised of the time, place, and purpose of formal ward meetings to be held two days later.

A STOP liaison officer served as a link for her ward between WEC and STOP and coordinated all campaign activity in her ward. Communications between headquarters and the ward and precinct organization of STOP in each ward were channeled through its STOP liaison officer.

A formal ward meeting in each ward, attended by the STOP liaison officer and by all precinct secretaries and volunteer campaign workers residing within its area, was held on the evening of May 20, five days before the recall election. Attendance, promoted by the WEC telephone chain, more than satisfied those who organized the meetings. Each meeting elected a ward chairman and, for each precinct in the ward, a precinct chairman and, for a few precincts, precinct co-chairmen. Four of the five ward chairmen and 43 of the 51 precinct chairmen and co-chairmen were members of WEC. Each of the formal ward meetings broke up into precinct groups, and the precinct chairman of each precinct group named block workers for each block or other designated area in the precinct. Block workers were supplied with voter card files. Cards in these files contained names of and information about each eligible voter in a particular block. Few block workers, except in precincts of western Little Rock, were residents of their assigned blocks. Most were residents of the fourth or fifth wards, in the western part of Little Rock.

Preparatory ward meetings of WEC members in each ward who had volunteered as campaign workers for STOP were held at homes of WEC members on the afternoon prior to the formal ward meetings. At each of these meetings an agenda for the formal ward meeting was drafted; a candidate for ward chairman was nominated. The ward's STOP liaison officer distributed a supply of campaign buttons, bumper strips, voting instructions, and other campaign materials; she also delivered voter card files for each precinct in the ward, prepared at WEC headquarters, for distribution by precinct secretaries to block workers at the formal ward meetings during the evening.

The WEC subsequently named poll watchers and count reporters for each ballot box in the school district; at least two poll watchers were named for each ballot box, four were named at ballot boxes served by judges and clerks who had signed counter recall petitions. WEC drafted instructions and obtained authorizations for all STOP poll watchers. Count reporters undertook to report the count of votes as tabulated during the evening of election day to STOP headquarters and, late on that day, to report names of STOP supporters who had not cast ballots. Of 78 poll watchers on election day, 70 were members of WEC or husbands of members; of 41 count reporters, 27 were members or husbands of members.

Voter Card Files

A file of typed cards listing the name and address of each member of WEC, of STOP, and of other known supporters, grouped by wards and precincts, was prepared on May 13 and 14 by the WEC to serve as a guide in recruitment of volunteer workers for STOP. All were asked by telephone to "stand by" for assignment as campaign workers.

To supplement the file of potential volunteer workers, and to guard against any possible loss or alteration of their recall petitions, each sheet of the STOP petitions was duplicated by photostatic reproduction. From these copies, a file of typed cards listing names and addresses of all signers was prepared and grouped by wards and precincts between May 16 and 20 by 54 volunteer workers enlisted by WEC and one worker paid by STOP. Each card listing a WEC member, STOP member, a known supporter, or a signer of STOP recall petitions was marked "saint."

Workers for STOP duplicated each sheet of the counter recall petitions in offices of the county clerk by photostatic reproduction. From these copies, a file of typed cards listing names and addresses of all signers was prepared at STOP headquarters; cards were classified by wards and precincts at offices of WEC. These cards and those of known segregationists were marked "sinner."

County collectors in Arkansas annually prepare an official poll book from receipts given citizens paying poll taxes. These poll books include the name, address, ward and—if poll taxes were paid in person rather than by mail—color of the voter. At the suggestion of Henry Woods, STOP workers prepared a file of typed cards which recorded these data for every eligible voter in the city of Little Rock. Each card in this file, classified by ward and precinct was labeled "saint," "sinner," or "savable."

It is estimated by WEC officers that preparation of the voter card files, completed on May 20, required ten shifts, each of not less than 36 workers and of not less than four hours duration. No attempt was made in preparing the voter card files to include the relatively few voters residing outside of the city but inside of the school district.

The voter card files of each precinct in a ward, listing eligible voters by blocks as "saints," "sinners," or "savables," were delivered to precinct secretaries at preparatory ward meetings on the afternoon of May 20 for distribution to their block workers at formal ward meetings that evening.

Contacting Voters

On the days immediately preceding the election, block workers for STOP contacted as many of the "saints" and "savables" as possible. "Saints" were urged to go to the polls. Block workers sought to learn the attitudes of "savables" on issues at stake in the election and, if a "savable" were undecided, to urge him to mark his ballot for removal of Laster, McKinley, and Rowland and against removal of Lamb, Matson, and Tucker. They were instructed to "leave 'sinners' alone." Block workers, according to officers of WEC, made about 23,000 calls, including calls made when the voters were unavailable. Block workers, rarely received in few instances, marked the cards of "savables" to indicate whether these voters were "friendly," "unfriendly," or "undecided." It is improbable that many votes were changed by the brief visits of block workers. It is probably that "savables," if disposed to support STOP prior to these visits, were encouraged to "go to the polls and vote" by the experience, novel at that time in Little Rock, of hearing open support for moderates.

CROSS, lacking a formal ward and precinct organization comparable to that hastily created by STOP, did not undertake to contact voters on an organized city-wide basis.

Publicity

Most voters in Little Rock, even those puzzled by the confusion of issues, were aware that their interests were involved in the outcome of the recall election. Propaganda of STOP and of CROSS sought to extend, quicken, and appeal to this awareness.

The political advertising of STOP pictured moderates on the school board as "schooled in good business practices;" pointed out that the three "have ten children in school;" emphasized need of the community for free public schools. The publicity of CROSS portrayed leaders of moderate organizations as members of an exclusive "silk stocking crowd" and "Cadillac brigade" from the "country club section" bent upon imposing integration on Negroes and "honest white people of the middle and lower classes."

Propaganda of STOP and CROSS reiterated a few "capsuled" themes that in a few words, or by a play on words, appealed to local predispositions. STOP described moderates on the school board as "the men who back the teachers;" criticized "interference by outsiders in local affairs;" urged voters to "CROSS out Laster, McKinley, and Rowland"; branded the dismissals as repugnant to union principles of "job security." CROSS appealed to "southerners"; characterized moderates as "Southern Traitors On Parade"; insisted that "token integration was integration," more easily prevented than contained.

"Fear arousing communications" of STOP predicted the closing of all local public schools; linked closed schools with the stymied progress of local industrial development. CROSS insisted that integrated schools were a prelude to "integrated neighborhoods" and sharp declines in residential property values. Dr. Alford referred to a "sinister conspiracy . . . abroad in the land which would not only destroy traditional social customs . . . but our individual liberties as well." McKinley claimed that the NAACP "is using segre-

gation versus integration as a smoke screen to more sinister efforts to socialize the government."

STOP branded segregationists on the school board as "purgers." CROSS branded all moderates as "integrationists" and associated integration with Daisy Bates, NAACP, "racial mongrelization," "left-wingers," "subversives," "fellow travelers," "Communists."

STOP appealed to friends, relatives, neighbors, and associates of the dismissed school employees by serial newspaper publication of the photographs and biographical sketches of 30 teachers "purged by the Guthridge slate." Photographs were obtained and biographies written by members of WEC.

STOP, with the advantage of a locally friendly press, may have benefited more from unsolicited editorials, cartoons, and generous and sympathetic news reporting than from paid advertising. A composite photograph appeared in the *Arkansas Gazette* of Sunday, May 24, the day before the recall election—and also traditionally the day for local high school baccalaureate exercises. It superimposed upon the empty halls of a local high school building an invitation to the parents of a "displaced" Little Rock senior to attend graduation exercises at Fairmont, West Virginia.

STOP was financially better able to utilize mass media of communication. Its expenditures for publicity by newspaper, radio, and television exceeded \$20,000. How much radio and television time STOP purchased is not known, but STOP and its allied organizations purchased 4,000 column-inches of advertising in local daily newspapers; CROSS and its affiliate groups, 1,511—all, with the exception of a single advertisement, in the *Arkansas Democrat*. STOP had more opportunity than did CROSS to use other organizations to present its appeals for support. The appeals for support by CROSS had the inherent advantage of objectives more consistent with locally established usage.

On and after May 18, WEC published a daily bulletin, *Stoplights*, through which the organization communicated with members and campaign workers and endeavored "to keep up the courage of those already saved." The bulletin also was mailed to members of STOP and to all precinct secretaries.

Rallies

Announced initially on May 17, the most important STOP rally was held on the evening of May 19 at the Municipal Auditorium to honor "all the teachers of Little Rock for their years of unselfish service to the community." Invitations were mailed to all its members and to STOP members by the WEC, which promoted attendance by its telephone chain. Approximately 350 public school teachers were seated on the stage and about 2,000 persons were in the audience to hear brief addresses by locally prominent representatives of industrial, labor, religious, medical, educational, and women's groups.

A statement given newsmen on May 18 by Dr. Taylor, based upon information from an unidentified source, reported: "Many Negroes, including Negro teachers, are planning to attend the integrationist rally . . . these Negroes will be seated alongside the whites in all parts of the auditorium." Mimeographed letters, over the typed name of Dr. Agar, appeared in Negro

sections of the city on the following day. Addressed "To Our Colored Friends," these spurious letters read: "We cannot win this fight without your active support . . . so, won't you please join us in this meeting and give your active support. . . ."

Dr. Agar announced that policemen would be present at the rally with instructions "gently" to turn away any Negroes seeking to attend. Two Negroes were escorted from the auditorium. A local Negro minister on May 18 announced a separate rally for Negroes—planned, he said, for several days—to honor Negro teachers. The separate rally, held on the evening of May 19, was attended by over 500 Negroes, including 75 Negro teachers.

The first CROSS rally was held on the evening of May 16 at the Marion Hotel "to hear Dr. Wesley A. Swift, State Director, Anti-Communist League of California and pastor of a well-known Los Angeles Church." Dr. Swift on the day of his arrival in Little Rock, May 13, told newsmen: "I've had a lot of experience along various lines in this struggle and we've come here to see what we can do." He left Little Rock three days later without making a public appearance. Cancellation of his address was announced at the rally and, subsequently, The Reverend Mr. Moser explained that some CROSS leaders deemed it unwise to have an "outsider" as speaker. The Reverend Mr. Moser, pinch hitting at the rally, told his audience that there is no such thing as token integration, since "if it's legally right for ten of them to be out there, it's going to be legal for all of them to be there." Laster predicted "violence," in event the closed high schools were reopened in September "that will make the Civil War look like a picnic." A subsequent CROSS rally, on the evening of May 23, featured Dr. Alford and Congressman John Bell Williams of Mississippi.

RECALL ALL

The "Recall All Committee," of uncertain origin and inspiration, entered the recall campaign on May 22. Its chairman, James A. Griffey, a linotype operator, was formerly a Little Rock alderman influential in municipal politics. The new organization claimed that recall of either half of the divided school board would "solve nothing"; urged voters to recall all six members and pave the way for appointment of an entirely new board of neither "die-hard segregationists" nor "dedicated integrationists." Griffey declined to reveal names of others on his committee; described them as "working people like myself." His committee, he said, contained "no high powered names"; had "very little money" and "no headquarters." The committee, between May 22 and 25, purchased 159 column-inches of advertising space—all in the *Arkansas Democrat*. Leaders of STOP and of CROSS accused each other of inspiring the Recall All Committee. Griffey denied affiliation with any organization.

Spokesmen for STOP and CROSS made traditional and politically appropriate "bandwagon" predictions of victory at the polls. Mitchell, on the eve of the election, urged voters to "be of stout heart, the devoted fathers and mothers of this community will definitely have schools for their children this fall"; The Reverend Mr. Moser asserted that he always had been "confident

that the good people of this city would not be hoodwinked by the professional integrationists and propagandists."

THE ELECTION

The "proposition is submitted" read the caption on ballots "whether any or all of the following members of the Board of Directors . . . shall be removed from office, or shall continue in office for the duration of his or their elected term." The county board of election commissioners, on advice of the prosecuting attorney, printed names of all six members of the school board in alphabetical order on ballots. Instructions on ballots directed the voter to place an "x" by each of the six names in a square labelled either "for removal" or "against removal."

The WEC, in cooperation with the League of Women Voters of Little Rock, was able to secure the appointment of a few election officials to vacancies occurring among judges and clerks previously named to serve at the recall election. The WEC and the League of Women Voters also named one or more stand-by election officials for every ballot box in the school district. In the event that legally appointed election officials fail to report for duty in Arkansas, substitutes may be named from voters at polling places. Many of the stand-by judges and clerk, reporting at 7:30 A.M. to assigned polling places, served as election officials during all or part of election day.

A motor pool in each ward was organized, and 33 telephone numbers, listing stations available to voters for transportation to and from polling places, were supplied by WEC to STOP in time for publication in newspapers on May 24. A similar advertisement of CROSS listed 35 telephone numbers, one for "ambulatory patients and invalids." The WEC reminded members to secure absentee ballots for bedfast relatives and friends, to provide servants with transportation to the polls; it also assigned members to nursing homes to provide inmates with similar transportation.

Aided by an official of the local housing authority, Henry Woods recruited 100 drivers and automobiles, and assigned each to one or more predominantly Negro areas of the city. Drivers, each with the assistance of one or more students from a Negro college enlisted through the cooperation of a Negro minister, methodically provided Negro voters within assigned areas with transportation to the polls.

Election day activities at WEC headquarters began at 8:05 A.M. when a stand-by election official by telephone reported her inability to "get sworn in"; ended at 7:10 P.M. with a telephone call reporting that election officials at one polling place, out of and awaiting delivery of ballots, were allowing voters to wait in line after 6:30 P.M., legal time for polling places to close. An officer of WEC estimated that "about 1,000" volunteer workers took part in efforts "to get out the vote" for STOP.

RESULTS

Fewer votes were cast in the recall election than had been anticipated, ranging from a maximum of 24,457 for and against removal of Lamb to a

minimum of 25,200 for and against removal of McKinley. Of 41,893 eligible voters in Little Rock itself, 24,194 (including all absentee votes)—only 57.8 percent—cast ballots. Although the total disappointed the campaigners, it was considerably higher than the usual rate of participation in school district elections.*

The official count showed that moderates were retained in office by slim majorities: Lamb by 431 votes, 50.8 percent of votes for and against his removal; Matson by 651 votes, 51.3 percent; Tucker by 1,224 votes, 52.4 percent. Segregationists were removed by slim majorities: McKinley by 1,480 votes, 52.9 percent of votes for and against his removal; Rowland by 2,165 votes, 54.3 percent; Laster by 2,761 votes, 55.5 percent. The vote within the city and in two precincts outside of the city is shown below:

	Total City	Rural Precincts	Absentee	Total
<i>STOP</i>				
1) Lamb	11,475	819	219	12,513
For Removal	12,196	444	304	12,944
Against Removal				
2) Matson	11,286	814	220	12,320
For Removal	12,220	450	301	12,971
Against Removal				
3) Tucker	11,090	797	206	12,093
For Removal	12,536	462	319	13,317
Against Removal				
<i>CROSS</i>				
4) Laster	13,120	530	346	13,996
For Removal	10,324	730	181	11,235
Against Removal				
5) McKinley	12,519	495	326	13,340
For Removal	10,892	768	200	11,860
Against Removal				
6) Rowland	12,866	488	338	13,692
For Removal	10,578	761	188	11,527
Against Removal				

Votes polled within the city of Little Rock, tabulated by precincts, are listed in the Appendix. Precincts are classified, on the basis of information supplied by the office of the county clerk of Pulaski County, in four groups; high-income white, middle-income white, low-income white, and Negro.

About 20 percent of all votes polled in the city at the recall election were cast by voters in high-income white precincts; 53 percent, by voters in middle-income white precincts; 10 percent, by voters in low-income white precincts; 17 percent, by voters in predominantly Negro precincts.

Taken together, the predominantly white precincts divided their votes evenly, and curiously, a majority supported the removal of both Lamb and

* Vote in the city for the three candidates for governor in the Democratic primary on July 29, 1958, was 27,731; in the school district for and against reopening all schools as integrated on September 27, 1958, 24,637; in the city in the Hays-Alford election on November 4, 1958, 24,441; in the school district for and against Laster on December 6, 1958, 13,571.

Laster, the leaders of their respective factions. Lamb's removal was favored by 53 percent; Laster's by 52.5 percent. But on closer inspection, the whites appeared to have divided along economic lines. The high-income white precincts voted overwhelmingly to retain Lamb and to remove Laster. In those precincts, the vote for these two was almost exactly obverse; that is, 70 percent voted to retain Lamb, and 78 percent voted to remove Laster. Those predominantly white precincts classified as middle-income supported Laster; 55 percent voted to retain him, while 60 percent voted to remove Lamb. In low-income white precincts, Laster scored heavily with 60 percent voting to retain him; 63 percent voted to remove Lamb.

In predominantly Negro districts, the approval of Lamb and the rejection of Laster were unmistakable and equally decisive; 74 percent voted to retain Lamb and 74 percent voted to remove Laster.

Thus, STOP's victory at the polls rested upon its support in high-income white precincts and in the predominantly Negro precincts. The combined totals in such precincts showed 72 percent voting to retain Lamb and 76 percent voting to remove Laster. The obverse relationships between the ballots cast for individuals and the direct relationships between the socio-economic characteristics of the precincts and voting behavior in this election are shown in the Appendix.

CONCLUSION

STOP and CROSS ceased to exist on the day following the recall election. Each organization, after a brief and hectic life, generally was assumed to be disbanded. The recall campaign of STOP, an *ad hoc* organization divorced from political parties and from political factions, probably qualified as a "model" of planning and execution, a high appraisal owed in part to the adequacy of financial support. Expenditures of STOP totalled over \$36,000; expenditures of CROSS and its allied organizations, not definitely known, are believed not to have exceeded \$10,000.

The county board of election commissioners, by naming three moderates on June 11 to vacancies on the school board, "followed" the election returns. The school board on June 25 announced the reopening of the four high schools on the basis of the pupil assignment acts. A new civic organization, the Committee for the Peaceful Operation of Free Public Schools, was established on July 17. The name of the Women's Emergency Committee to Open Our Schools was changed in September to the Women's Emergency Committee for Public Schools. The community, from the ranks of STOP, acquired new leadership.

After the recall election, segregationists in Little Rock seemed less willing to advocate closed public schools as an alternative to token school integration. Mrs. Margaret Morrison, member of the Mothers' League and prominent as a leader and spokesman of segregationists, unsuccessfully opposed Tucker for reelection to the school board in December, 1959—seven months after the recall election. Her published pronouncement that "you should never close public schools" would have been endorsed seven months earlier by Lamb, Matson, and Tucker; disavowed by Laster, McKinley, and Rowland.

APPENDIX

VOTES FOR AND AGAINST REMOVAL OF TED L. LAMB AND ROBERT W. LASTER BY PRECINCTS, LITTLE ROCK SCHOOL DISTRICT RECALL ELECTION

<i>LAMB</i>		<i>WHITE PRECINCTS</i> <i>High-Income</i>	<i>LASTER</i>	
<i>For Removal</i>	<i>Against Removal</i>		<i>For Removal</i>	<i>Against Removal</i>
267	424	4E	479	215
178	368	5C	418	124
381	1,015	5D	1,110	267
383	982	5E	1,084	273
133	283	5F	316	97
92	211	5G	244	61
1,434	3,283	Total	3,651	1,037
		<i>Middle-Income</i>		
363	288	1A	319	328
531	347	1D	379	488
294	213	3A*	232	286
272	73	3B	84	255
422	206	3D	229	351
385	187	3E	228	342
649	618	3F	622	648
87	158	3G*	169	70
994	709	4A	805	916
785	546	4B	571	732
592	99	4C	136	562
919	380	4D	459	835
600	497	5A	576	517
565	733	5B	838	454
7,458	5,054	Total	5,647	6,784
		<i>Low-Income</i>		
364	279	1C	316	320
235	149	2A	165	216
719	335	2B	340	722
254	155	2C	176	232
1,572	918	Total	997	1,490
10,464	9,255	TOTAL	10,295	9,311
		<i>NEGRO PRECINCTS</i>		
92	629	1B	624	76
538	1,069	1E	1,106	484
81	334	2D	302	86
196	500	2E	405	256
104	409	3C	388	111
1,011	2,941	TOTAL	2,825	1,103
1,038	748	Other Precincts †	876	911
12,513	12,944	TOTAL	13,966	11,235

* Regarded by Corinne Silverman as containing "such a racial and economic mixture as to prevent classification." See *The Little Rock Story*. Inter-University Case Program, No. 41, 1959.

† Includes votes cast in two precincts outside of Little Rock and all absentee votes.